## 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 4 5 SHADAE RAE SEWARD, et al., Case No. 2:25-cv-00857-NJK 6 Plaintiff(s), Order 7 v. 8 FRANK J. BISIGNANO, 9 Defendant(s). Plaintiff brings this suit on behalf of her child challenging the denial of the child's disability 10 claim. See Docket No. 1-1. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se. The Ninth Circuit has held that "a non-12 attorney parent must be represented by counsel in bringing an action on behalf of his or her child." Johns v. Cnty. of San Diego, 114 F.3d 874, 876 (9th Cir. 1997). 13 14 On May 19, 2025, the Court ordered Plaintiff to retain counsel to litigate this case. Docket 15 No. 5 at 1. The Court ordered Plaintiff's retained counsel to file a notice of appearance to represent 16 Plaintiff by July 18, 2025. *Id.* The Court warned that "**[f]ailure to comply with this order may** 17 result in dismissal of this case." Id. (emphasis in original). Despite that warning, Plaintiff has 18 not complied with the above order. 19 Accordingly, this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. The Clerk's Office is 20 **INSTRUCTED** to close the case. 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 Dated: July 28, 2025 23 Nancy J. Koppe 24 United States Magistrate Judge 25 26 <sup>1</sup> The Ninth Circuit has not recognized exceptions to this rule as to any particular type of See Grizzell v. San Elijo Elementary Sch., 110 F.4th 1177, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2024) (recognizing out-of-circuit authority creating an exception to the counsel mandate in the social security context, but finding that such cases are inconsistent with binding Ninth Circuit precedent),

security context, but finding that such cases are inconsistent with binding Ninth Circuit preceder cert. denied, \_\_ S. Ct. \_\_\_, 2025 WL 1426678 (May 19, 2025).